R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 062 RC 002 052

THE EXPANDING RANGE OF OCCUPATIONAL AND TRAINING SERVICES FOR RURAL YOUTH.

BY- ALLER, CURTIS C.

PUB DATE 23 OCT 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.68 15P.

DESCRIPTORS- ASPIRATION, AMERICAN INDIANS, FAMILY (SOCIOLOGICAL UNIT), LOW INCOME, MINORITY GROUPS, MIGRATION, NEGROES, ORIENTATION, *OCCUPATIONS, *PROGRAMS, *RURAL AREAS, *RURAL YOUTH, RURAL POPULATION, *TRAINING, VALUES,

THE VALUE ORIENTATION OF MANY RURAL YOUTH FAILS TO BRING ABOUT SUCCESSFUL TRANSITION INTO THE COUNTRY'S LABOR FORCE. THIS FAILURE IS MORE PRONOUNCED WITH THOSE YOUTH WHO EXPERIENCE EXTREME ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION, ESPECIALLY IF THEY ARE FROM A MINORITY GROUP SUCH AS NEGROES, SPANISH AMERICANS, OR INDIANS. THE GOVERNMENT HAS A RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITIES, INDUSTRIES, AND INDIVIDUALS TO ALLEVIATE MANPOWER PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN THE RURAL TO URBAN TRANSITION. TWO BASIC ELEMENTS NEEDED IN A MANPOWER PROGRAM GEARED TO THE PROBLEMS OF RURAL YOUTH ARE--(1) AN IMPROVED SYSTEM OF INFORMATION ABOUT EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES, AND (2) A NEED FOR ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE THROUGH EXPANDING JOB OPPORTUNITIES. SOME PROGRAMS WHICH HAVE AFFORDED TRAINING TO MANY RURAL YOUTH INCLUDE--THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT, THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS ACT, THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT, AND THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT. THROUGH THE CONTINUATION AND EXTENSION OF THESE TYPES OF PROGRAMS A SMOOTHER TRANSITION WILL BE REALIZED BY RURAL YOUTH. THIS SPEECH WAS PRESENTED AT THE NATIONAL OUTLOOK CONFERENCE ON RURAL YOUTH, OCTOBER 23-26, 1967, WASHINGTON, D. C., SPONSORED JOINTLY BY THE U. S. DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, INTERIOR, AND LABOR, OEO, AND THE PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL ON YOUTH OPPORTUNITY. (ES)

ED015062

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Special Session on Education and
Training of Rural Youth

Speech presented at
NATIONAL OUTLOOK CONFERENCE
ON RURAL YOUTH
October 23-26, 1967
Washington, D. C.

RECEIVED
DEC 18 1967
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

THE EXPANDING RANGE OF OCCUPATIONAL AND TRAINING SERVICES FOR RURAL YOUTH

Dr. Curtis C. Aller
Director
Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research
U. S. Department of Labor
Washington, D. C.

This Nation has put together a remarkable kit of manpower tools in the last few years. Many of these tools are designed to enable us to work with the youth in our economy, to move new workers as rapidly as we can into jobs, and more importantly, into meaningful work opportunities that will enable them to move up both in income terms, and in terms of satisfying other important objectives of life.

In spite of my optimism over what we have done in recent years, I recognize that we have not done enough in tailoring our programs for the needs of young persons in rural areas. I believe, however, that we are beginning to face up to these programming problems and are on our way to solving them.

It is probably reasonable to say that the term "rural youth" itself accounts for some of our program problems. We have been discovering that, just as the urban environment has a built-in diversity of people with implications for manpower programs, similarly rural youngsters find themselves in a variety of circumstances.

We cannot ignore, for example, the family circumstances for our rural youth. Among farm families, now only a quarter of the rural population, there are strong contrasts that have clear effects on manpower programming. The value orientations of the commercial farm family leave little need for special occupational and training service programs. Characteristically, these million or so prosperious farm families pass to their children the kinds of aspirations and occupational goals which are readily transferable to eventual participation in urban life. Their children tend to finish high school and a goodly number go on to college. Typically the 75 percent who eventually leave for an urban life are reasonably prepared for non-agriculture jobs. This group requires minimal service in terms of occupational training programs.

Two other types of families provide their children with a value orientation that suggests a minimal need for manpower services: professional and business families of high status in the small towns, whose orientation

RC 002 052

to education and occupations virtually guarantees a successful transition into the labor force, and families whose orientations and sources of livelihood are essentially urban, but whose residence is rural.

Consider in contrast, the youngsters from a subsistence farm family or the poorer town dwellers. In the main, theirs is not a middleclass business orientation, nor are their values. Research consistently shows a low level of aspiration. No great stress is placed on education. Leaving high school before graduation is not unusual, and participation and involvement in community affairs and services is rare. Clearly, the need for occupational and training services here is great. In addition special means must be devised which recognize isolation and lack of involvement and which encourage the use of those programs and services that are available.

Finally, there is the minority family--not mutually exclusive of those already discussed --the Negro families of the South, the Spanish-American families of the Southwest, and the Indian families on and off reservations. These families include many youngsters for whom appropriate training and occupational services are essential. Characteristically, as we know, their educational attainments are low and their work futures uncertain. Here we come to grips with the major programming task in providing occupational and training services for rural youth.

Let me make clear my intent in drawing distinctions. I am aware that they are incomplete and that many other factors are equally important. Regional differences, for example, are not to be ignored. The youngsters in Appalachia cannot be equated with youngsters in many counties of the upper Midwest.

As some of our research suggests, we cannot ignore the fact that in some rural regions Horatio Algar lives, and hard work and making good are vital themes. Obviously, and for good reason this is less so in other regions of the country. But the point to be made here is that manpower service programming must be tailored to the population to which it is addressed, not only in content but in its form and manner of approach. I believe that the history of manpower programs in the last decade shows that we have paid heed to these vital distinctions more in urban than in rural circumstances.

The newness of many manpower programs which are reaching rural youth and providing them with an "expanding range of occupational and training services," means that, we are more able to point to the merits of the new program ideas than to the numbrical force of their problem-solving ability. I believe that as our sources of information about rural youth improve our perspectives and understanding of their problems, we increasingly will generate new program approaches to remove some of the extraordinary delemmas which so many rural youngsters now face in their search for an appropriate place in the work of modern, industrial society.

Dr. Curtis C. Aller

There is the need to recognize the government's responsibility for taking active steps to help communities, industries, and individuals to overcome those difficult manpower problems which simply are not being met by the institutions and processes of the job market. These responsibilities go far beyond provisions for occupational and training services. While we must do what we can to make rural to urban migration a more rational and efficient process, we must do it in conjunction with broader programs aimed at developing growth and economic viability in rural areas. We cannot choose one direction to the exclusion of the other. The megalopolis is undoubtedly here to stay, but it cannot be all things to all people.

Let me outline two basic elements of an overall manpower program which are especially relevant to the problems of rural youth as we understand them today.

1. The need for rural areas is an improved system of information about employment opportunities and outlooks; expanded job placement services, vocational counseling; including for each youngster a realistic evaluation of his aptitudes in terms of their relevance to his occupational interest; finding ways to further assist urban-bound migrants in their preparation and search for a job.

2. The second great need for rural areas is economic assistance through expanding job opportunities by means of economic development in depressed areas; increasing jobs in conservation; assisting small farm operators to develop supplementary sources of income and developing work experience programs for the young designed for both training and the testing of occupational interest.

Specifically this rural effort must include measures to insure good elementary and secondary education for all young people in rural areas; financial assistance and incentives to help needy youngsters stay in school, including encouragement to higher education for those who are able; effective vocational education, emphasizing skills needed in growing industries and occupations; and increased training and work experience opportunity for jobless out-of-school youth.

With these broad program ambitions as background let us examine more closely the opportunities afforded to young people in rural areas by the manpower-related programs legislated in recent years through the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA), and Economic Development and Public Works Act (EDA), Economic Opportunity Act (EOA), and the Vocational Education Act (VEA). I will also discuss some of our past programming problems and some of the solutions that are now in sight.

Dr. Curtis C. Aller

MDTA Training

We estimate that over 60 thousand rural youth have participated in MDTA training programs, both instutional and on-the-job, during the five years of MDTA operations, and that approximately 75 million dollars have been expended for their training. In terms of proportions, about one in five enrollees in MDTA programs to date were classified as rural and about one out of three of the rural trainees were under age 22. This means that young rural people accounted for about 6.5 percent of all MDTA enrollees--somewhat greater than the 4 percent they represented of the total population 16 and over in 1960.

In 1966, close to 45 thousand rural residents participated in MDTA courses, while about one-sixth of them enrolled in agriculture-related occupations, the remainder received training in some 43 non-agricultural skills such as welding, auto mechanics and clerical and sales training.

The Manpower Development and Training Act authorizes a national program of occupational training. Given its limited resources the MDTA services have been aimed at people who have the most serious employment and vocational training problems, those who are least able to adjust to the drastic changes occurring in the job market and who are mostly likely to be missed by established manpower development and related services. This group includes unskilled workers with low educational attainment, minority group members facing barriers in moving up the occupational ladder, the long term unemployed, unemployed people moving to urban areas, and people in chronically depressed areas. In short, it seeks to ease the most severe personal handships and social and economic tentions without duplicating state, local government, and private manpower activities.

In keeping with this mission effort has been made to promote training opportunities in rural communities where low-income and other economic deficiencies prevail. Farm families that have less than a total annual income of $1200 are considered unemployed under the Act and are, therefore, eligible for training allowances. Also with MDTA support, each regional Employment Service office now has rural manpower training specialists assigned to expand and improve training and manpower services for rural workers, to coordinate the development of new techniques for improving skills, and to make available a more complete range of manpower services in rural areas.

As with all programs in rural areas, low population density is an ever present problem. Under MDTA, the development of the individual referral plan has helped to overcome the problems inherent in arranging training classes for a widely dispersed population. Under the plan, individuals may be referred to training in ongoing institutions since the small numbers of persons involved make it infeasible to establish an MDTA class for each of several occupations. Contracts recently signed with several national business schools operating in eight states will allow rural residents to be referred to training slots in these private

schools. The MDTA will provide subsistence, allowances, and the necessary supportive services.

The MDTA program is also attempting to involve community groups such as the rural community action agencies in the training effort. In Eastern Kentucky, several agencies have undertaken the development of on-the-job training projects. Under a project sponsored by the AFL-CIO Appalachian council in 11 states, three thousand disadvantaged persons from the Appalachian region will be placed in on-the-job training with the help of local unions. Preference will be given in selection to enrollees from the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, and the Title V program of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Neighborhood Youth Corps Program

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is one of the largest Federal programs for youth. It is estimated that close to one-third, or almost 418 thousand of the NYC enrollment opportunities, have been extended to rural youth since the program began on January 1, 1965 at a cost of about 226 million. In fiscal year 1967, 657 or 45 percent of all NYC projects were in rural areas. They served 177,000 enrollees, about one-third of the total. In its brief history, the NYC has linked its program with the work of agencies such as the Soil Conservation Service, the Agricultural Extension Service, the Bureau of Public Roads, Rural Community Action Agencies, and several farm organizations.

The NYC program holds great promise and utility for rural youngsters, because rural areas are well represented, but also because of its proven dynamic character, its willingness to expand its responsibility and scope as a youth program. Initially, the NYC mission was to keep youngsters of low-income families in school, or encourage them to return to school if they had already left. This was to be done primarily through counseling and earnings from a part-time job. An important element in the NYC is its resolve to see that its work experience programs lead to something else. This implies a strong follow-up of individual enrollees to assure that they receive the services needed for a successful transition into the work force. Some of the forward looking features in a strengthened NYC program call for: (1) greater vocational emphasis in the work experience program, leading to more training-related jobs and fewer of the menial variety; (2) increased counseling services of a form and content that would be more meaningful for out-of-school as well as in-school enrollees; (3) improved screening of project sponsors to assure genuine sponsor interest in the enrollees and their problems and strong commitment to the NYC program idea.

To show the particular relevance of such changes, let me summarize some preliminary observations we have received from a research project we are sponsoring in the Midwest which is concerning itself with some of the knottier problems of "Optimizing the benefits of NYC projects for

rural youth." Outmigration is a characteristic of most rural areas touching all its population segments and affecting all aspects of rural life. More than an attempting flight of the rural poor from the hardships of poverty, it also affects the better educated young people of the more prosperious families. Those who go on to college usually do not return to their home communities because their skills are not needed there. This affects our program efforts in smaller communities where the leadership is aging, the people are strongly traditional, their outlook, and in fact are often opposed to the initiation of new programs to aid their young. This is well illustrated by the inadequacies of the small school system in vocational counseling and vocational training offerings. With an inadequate tax base for school support, the system is not large enough to warrant a full range of training opportunities. The high school curriculum is largely college-oriented, while vocational course offerings are often few and ordinarily limited to agricultural pursuits. Based on available findings to date, it is difficult to estimate whether rural NYC projects have more frequent operating difficulties than do urban projects. However, the investigators did observe that the NYC programs which operate on a multi-county basis were more acceptable to rural leaders than those operating on a single-county basis. Multi-county projects provide a greater variety of job placements and often come under the control of a full-time administrator of a multi-county community action program. This invariably assures more effective supervision of local people who work directly with NYC enrollees.

We have also learned that it is desirable to provide the rural youngster with work experience which allows him to test out his job interests in an urban environment. During the summer of 1967, five experimental and demonstration projects were conducted to find ways of achieving this. The projects, located in Goldsboro, North Carolina; Lynchburg, Virginia; Jackson, Tennessee; Athens, Georgia; and New Orleans, Louisiana, provided an opportunity for approximately 190 rural youngsters to work in and learn about life in the city. These summer urban orientation programs concentrated on disadvantaged youngsters in their teens, many from large or broken families, all of whom had poverty level incomes.

The program was designed to provide total, full-time exposure to the urban environment. In the North Carolina project, for example, enrollees in the city of Goldsboro lived in dormitories for eight week, returning to their homes only on weekends. All participated in a realistic work situation which brought them into contact with a variety of people and tasks. The full-time jobs ranged from clerical duties at a nearby Air Force base to assisting group workers in recreation and other activities at a school for the mentally retarded. Job orientation, counseling and on-the-job visits by the staff constituted some of the project support services. Instruction in math and language arts was also offered on a tutorial basis. Cultural and musical activities were added as were field

trips to such places as Williamsburg, Jamestown, the State Capitol, and art museums. For many of the enrollees, these activities were "first experiences."

Much of our program experience suggests that perhpas we start too late with our concern for the work futures of our youth, that our program emphasis should be more clearly developmental as distinct from the remedial cast of our present programs. Given the unique disadvantaged faced by youngsters of poor families in rural areas, we considered ways of helping such youths under 16 to meet their school responsibilities. As a result the minimum age limit for in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees was lowered from 16 to 14. Another might be straight scholarships for some impoverished youngsters without requiring them to do outside work for their money. Alternatively, we can continue to view the young child's school attendance as dependent on the overall resources of the parents and explore family income supplements such as children's allowances, the so-called negative income tax, and modifications of public assistance procedures.

Vocational Guidance For Rural Youth

The choice of vocations is particularly difficult for rural youth. To help them select appropriate courses of education and training, youngsters are encouraged to make some kind of tentative occupational choice years in advance of entering the labor force. Similarly, schools must take choices on the content of their vocational training based on estimates of what skill requirements will look like years in the future. These decisions must be made in the face of rapidly changing technology and manpower needs, with little knowledge of the independent and competing decisions of other youngsters and of other schools. Obviously, manpower development programs must place great emphasis on accurate assessment of future manpower requirements and resources and on competent vocational guidance of rural youth. Yet such services are relatively scarce and sometimes completely absent. All too often rural school authorities limit the use of guidance services, or inadequate financial resources do not permit them, or narrow school offerings reduct their utility.

For many smaller rural areas, the Department of Labor's Cooperative Employment Service School Program offers the only vocational guidance service available. The program provides help to high school seniors, dropouts, and summer job hunters. Each fall, on invitation from the high school, a representative of the United States Employment Service visits the school and explains the available services to all the seniors. Those seniors who are not going to college and others who desire assistance in career planning and job hunting are then given aid in the form of job counseling, aptitude testing and placement services. During the last academic year, over 500,000 seniors registered for various kinds of assistance. Assistance is also offered to those who have dropped out

of school. Last year over 82,000 dropouts were aided and 40 percent were placed in jobs. The Employment Service also found employment for over 240,000 rural youths during the 1966 summer.

All told, the Cooperative School Program serves almost 1/2 of the high schools in the country. Although detailed statistics are not available, the program is probably underrepresented in the smaller schools, many of which serve rural youth. Higher program priority should be given to servicing small rural schools, and ways must be found to reestablish service to those school systems where lack of compliance with civil rights requirements has curtailed such programs.

Other needs in the vocational guidance and counseling programs which particularly benefit rural youth are:

1. Special provisions in the urban local employment offices for imigrant rural and small town youth. Interstate plans which would provide the rural population a greater range of placement opportunities are also needed.

2. Additional itinerant counselors for remote areas.

3. Intensified outreach to isolated rural areas and small communities through expanded use of mobile teams and offices.

4. Counseling of youth about mobility prior to his decision to more and providing greater access to nationwide labor market information, especially about the major cities to which the young migrate.

Pilot Program on Labor Mobility

Labor mobility demonstration projects, authorized under MDTA, have been conducted since early 1965 by the Federal-state employment security system. The pilot projects are designed in part to determine the effectiveness of relocation allowances as a means of reducing employment. Major emphasis has been placed on assisting those unemployed persons who are planning to move from a rural to an urban environment. To be eligible for assistance, the prospective recipient must have received an offer of a permanent job in the area in which he intends to relocate. Job placement and job development services are also provided by the program.

Results to date indicate that a many-sided approach in worker relocation assistance is needed to overcome immobility which prolongs unemployment in rural areas and that a carefully controlled program of relocation assistance with supportive services at point of destination can be constructive force in rural outmigration.

Dr. Curtis C. Aller

Aggregative Program Efforts

Several other of our manpower service programs follow through on our recognition that rural areas can best be served by an aggregative approach, which broadens the base of the efforts either on a numerical basis or on a program content basis.

The Iowa State Manpower Council, funded as an experimental and demonstration program by the Manpower Administration is one such project which served as a forerunner to comparable efforts in other States. Although not strictly rural, it devised an important means for solving a basic programming problem in many rural areas that is establishing a sufficient population base for the efficient operation of a manpower service. The Iowa State Manpower Council developed the first statewide on-the-job training contract, which made the State the agency by which OJT subcontracts were negotiated and trainees were placed. This brings the benefits of OJT to more residents of rural areas, particularly those from more remote communities in which the number of potential trainees is insufficient to support an OJT training program on its own. Five other states are now following the Iowa example with prime contracts for OJT programs being negotiated on a statewide basis.

Another effort at a more collective approach to providing manpower services to the rural areas, particularly its poorer residents, was also first explored in an E & D program. This effort began four years ago in a conference held in Norfolk, Virginia, where a unique training program was already operating. The conference brought together Presidents and other officers of Southeastern rural colleges to discuss "the college as a regional center for training rural workers." The Norfolk program served as an example of what can happen when a single team is responsible to a single authority for all the components of a manpower program: Recruitment, testing, screening, intake, curriculum planning, case work, supportive counseling, and job placement. It demonstrated what the cultural resources of a college could mean for the disadvantaged rural poor, and how the status of a college-supported, college-sponsored program can more readily elicit community action.

As a result of this conference, a network of college-based rural training programs was created using college facilities and administrative resources which are not available in most impoverished rural areas. Each of the college programs developed its own emphasis for testing a wide variety of experimental goals. For example, the Florida A & M University project sought to demonstrate the effectiveness of special services including the recruitment, selection, training, and placement of low income rural workers; the use of volunteer committees in providing follow-up services after training; and a first effort at providing instruction about the urban environment as a means of reducing job finding problems among the probable migrants from rural areas. Occupational training in the Florida project included: auto service station operation, cooking, general sales, upholstery, and several other fields.

Another project, at Northern Michigan University, concentrated on testing the revolving group concept of training which was devised to adapt to the small number of potential trainees available in rural areas. The revolving group form of training also allows for an individualized instruction approach and provided some flexibility in the time a trainee must spend in the program. Starting with perhaps 30 trainees, the training schedule is maintained by adding new trainees as earlier enrollees graduate or leave the program.

There were approximately 13 such programs located at colleges and universities in the South and Midwest which have provided training and supported services to disadvantaged rural youth.

In addition to the college-based rural program, projects with similar objectives have been carried out by groups such as the Arizona Migrant and Indian Ministry, which provided seasonal migrant workers with basic education and an opportunity for year-round employment. A later complementary program was developed for pre-job orientation, pre-apprenticeship on-the-job training, physical training and remedial work, particularly for those young migrant workers not meeting usual requirements for entrance to training classes.

A Revised Approach to Manpower Development in Rural Areas

It is quite apparent that we need new ways of dealing with rural manpower development--ways which go beyond the aggregation of program resources and which would at once overcome the special programming difficulties that are common to all rural areas and which would take into account the diversity of circumstances that exist among rural populations. The need for increased programming in rural areas is clear: by income definition, one in three rural families is poor; chronic poverty, by whatever definition, marks the families of sharecroppers, other subsistence-level farmers, migratory farm workers, and hired hands on farm and in small towns alike. In many rural areas the quality of elementary and secondary education is substandard, often being particularly inadequate in preparing youth for the specific skills required in urban work. As it must, outmigration continued, with the loss, in many cases, occurring on the side of the more productive worker. The lack of balance in the remaining labor force undoubtedly hinders the prospects for attracting industry and otherwise improving the economic base of rural areas.

Although it may be trite to complain that a piece-meal program approach will not do the job, it is nevertheless clear that this statement has a special validity for rural areas. Realistic economic planning has been a major obstacle in most rural areas, partly because of the lack of technical competence required to analyze the economic circumstances and associated manpower needs, and partly because of the

lack of information needed for such a task. In addition, while it is undoubtedly true that rural-urban differences are diminishing with time, differences which affect our program efforts continue to exist and must be taken into account. The many rural community studies conducted during recent decades have consistently shown that a relatively static orientation of life is characteristic of many rural dwellers. Community resistance to change is persistant, particularly with respect to educational and vocational offerings, and adds a special difficulty in providing occupational and training services.

More extensive use of planning grants to local program sponsors is one device that can be used to improve program beginnings. Another trend of great promise is the concerted and concentrated services approach to meeting our manpower problems. In the manpower field there are relatively new techniques of program construction. Their prospect for success arises from three crucial provisions common to both; first, a specific avoidance of the narrow view which focuses on a specific problem; second, a determination to effectively coordinate the program efforts with all private and public agencies which could provide supportive services; and thirdly, a commitment to include the local leadership in both the planning and execution stages of the program.

Smaller Communities Program

The Smaller Communities Program first addressed itself to these problems years ago when the Department of Labor in concert with several State employment security agencies undertook an experimental program to develop a special mobile office technique to service remote rural areas not previously provided with adquate manpower services. At the request of community groups interested in improving the economy of their areas, a mobile team of StateEmployment Service interviewers, occupational counselors, a youth specialist, and test administrators assisted by labor market analyst move into the area generally for a period of about three or four months. The service the mobile team provided include (1) determining the current and potential manpower resources of the area, (2) assisting in the evaluation of the overall economic resources of the area, (3) cooperating with other agencies and community groups in developing programs for economic development, (4) providing employment counseling, testing, and placement services to individuals for jobs within or outside the area, especially within commuting distance; and (5) determining occupational training needs of the area and the training interest and potential of the residents.

Over the years, the growth of the Smaller Communities Program has been steady, but modest. There are 20 mobile teams operating in 18 States and serving more than 200 counties which do not have permanent employment offices.

Dr. Curtis C. Aller

The "Concerted Services Approach," currently being implemented on an experimental basis, is an outgrowth of the Smaller Communities Program.

Along with the recognition that any manpower program should be fashioned to suit the special needs of the rural community to be served, the concerted services approach seeks to expand the range of programs available by drawing on the resources of other appropriate Federal agencies.

The task force developing this approach currently includes representatives from the Department of Agriculture; Commerce; Health, Education and Welfare; Housing and Urban Development; Labor; and, the Small Business Administration.

A comprehensive manpower program for rural areas under the Concerted Services approach should help individuals obtain the general education and work skills they need to achieve their maximum skill and earnings potential, in line with their interest and aptitude, and help meet the complex skill requirements of the rural area's employers. Elements of a well-rounded manpower development program for rural areas under the Concerted Services approach embrace the following:

1. Measures to insure good elementary and secondary education for all young people in rural areas.
2. Financial assistance to help needy youngsters stay in school and to move on to higher education if they are qualified.
3. Effective vocational education--emphasizing skills in growing industries and occupations. This should include the provision of training and work experience opportunities for jobless out-of-school youth.
4. Retraining facilities for unemployed adults, supplemented by allowances to help them support their families during the training period.
5. Facilities for part-time adult education to help employed workers upgrade and update their skills and knowledge.
6. Alternatives in the form of work opportunity or income maintenance when work is not available or training not feasible.
7. Day care centers for children of training and working mothers.

Expericnes to date with the pilot projects under way in Arkansas, Minnesota and New Mexico, has shown that Federal and State agencies working together with the local leaders can effectively bring education and training opportunities to rural residents. This approach provides an effective means for introducing new programs, such as job training for welfare recipients under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Human Resources Development Program of the Public Employment Service. In the pilot counties, three times as many people are now

participating in new programs of training and education as in other similar rural counties. High priority will be given to extending this promising new approach.

Concentrated Employment Program

In the spring of 1967, the Labor Department created a pool of funds totaling nearly $100 million from the delegated manpower programs of the Economic Opportunity Act and from the Manpower Development and Training Act, to be used for a Concentrated Employment Program.

Grants have been made to cities and two rural areas, the Mississippi Delta and Northern Michigan, both marked by severe and chronic unemployment.

The Concentrated Employment Program was developed in recognition that the traditional approaches to alleviating poverty and poverty related problems are not likely to suffice; that they must be vastly expanded into areas and functions not hitherto generally considered parts of the traditional range of supportive services. By its concentration on small areas with a set of definable common problems, the aim is to fashion the program to the needs and individual character of the particular areas in which it will function.

--The programs are devised to draw out and to deal with only the hardest cases of people who are poor and unemployed.
--These cases are dealt with on a basis which recognizes that the unemployment results more from personal characteristics than economic conditions. There is a strong individualization of the training and job referral (and follow-up) functions.
--There is a substantial enlistment of private employer (and labor union) interest and participation in the program.
--The entire project is worked out in a single agreement with the local agency involved, although the components may come from the MDTA or Economic Opportunity Act authorizations and appropriations.

This, the Concentrated Employment Program is an administrative attempt to combine a variety of work experience and training programs with supportive services, in a single contract for a specific geographic area. The community action agencies in most of the selected areas will serve as the prime sponsor and coordinating body.

The program provides a two-week general orientation program in which coaches or counselors will work with enrollees on an individual basis to prepare them for referral to the action phase of the program, either to jobs, to the most suitable training program, to school when that is deemed appropriate, or to some combination of the three. An intensive effort will be made to encourage private employers and labor unions to provide specific job opportunities that have previously been closed to

hard-core jobless. Coaches will maintin contact with enrollees even after they take jobs, provided whatever assistance in necessary to make to him self-sufficient on the job. Throughout the program, enrollees will receive supportive services as required to allow them to move toward productive employment. This will include, where necessary, medical and dental care, legal help, day-care facilities for children of working mothers, and orientation on the use of available transportation.

The Mississippi Delta Concentrated Employment Program will serve an 18--county area of the Delta, which is home to some 40,000 unemployed persons, 40,000 underemployed persons, and a preponderance of families headed by women.

The Delta Program will combine 20 different program components including MDTA basic education and occupational instruction, on-the-job training, direct placement, and many supportive services. Employment and related services will be extended to an estimated 3 to 4 thousand people during the 18 month life of the program. Once recruited, the enrollee will spend two weeks at one of the two Orientation Assessment Centers that have been established. The Center will determine each individual's needs in preparation for placement in one of several employment programs.

Although the CEP for the present fiscal year is primarily an urban effort, with a start in only two rural areas, tentative plans are to extend its application to six rural areas in FY 1968 and 75 rural areas in 1969.

Conclusion

I have tried not to belabor the many statistics and other points of information that tell us that young people in rural areas need help in preparing for and finding appropriate jobs. That there is a desparage need for increased manpower services in rural areas is a plain and irrefutable fact. Perhaps our awareness and concern about problems of rural to urban migration sometimes clouds our sense of priorities. There is sometimes a tendency to choose between the problems; either urban, or rural. The choices, however, are not of an "either, or" variety. Both urban and rural problems demand ample measures of attention. To do otherwise is merely to nurse a problem which is sure to loom larger in the years ahead. The concerted and concentrated approaches, now being implemented as means for providing manpower services more intensively, make eminent sense. Such programs are consistent with the broader goals of our manpower policy, that is:

--to sort out the talents and potentials of the young and to assure each individual a chance to use them.

Dr. Curtis C. Aller

--to fashion programs that can stand the tests of economic and social feasibility. In rural areas especially this calls for aggregation of effort and for community participation.
--to recognize resource limitations and to center efforts on those problems and persons whose needs are greatest and most immediate.
--and finally to raise our sights beyond the traditional form of reactive programming, that is to look forward to the time we can devote most of our efforts to solving emerging problems through acticipatory planning rather than by after the fact remedial action.

In briefer terms, we will have done well to the extent that we smooth the transitions between the many life events which affect a person's work. For rural youth we have a beginning.